Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
✆ : 08175-573820
2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
✆ : 08175-573820
2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by

SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers

Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya

Holenarasipur - 573211

©: 08175-573820

2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by

SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers

Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya

Holenarasipur - 573211

©: 08175-573820

2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
✆ : 08175-573820
2004

ABBREVIATIONS

The name of each Upanishad or any other work has been contracted into the initial letter or letters and the Bhāshya thereon has been indicated by the Symbol 'Bh'. (भा.), i.e. G - Gītā ; G.Bh. = Gītā Bhāshya.

अ.भा.	Intro.	Introduction to Sūtra-Bhāshya
क.	Ka.	Kāthakōpanishad
के.	Ke.	Kenōpanishad
कौ.	Kau.	Kaushītakī Upanishad
गी.	G.	The Bhagavadgīta
गौ.का.	G.K.	Gaudapāda's Kārikās on the Māndūkya Upanishad
छां.	Ch.	Chāndōgyōpanishad
नै.सि.	Nai.Si.	Naishkarmya Siddhi of Sureswarāchārya
पं.पा.	Pan.	Pañchapādikā, a sub-commentary by Sri Padmapādāchārya on the Sūtra-Bhāshya
पं.वि.	P.V.	Pañchapādikā-Vivarana, a sub-commentary by Prakāśātmayati on the Panchapādikā.
पा.	P.	Page ; Pp. pages.
बृ.	Br.	Brahadāranyakōpanishad
भा	Bha.	Bhāmati, a sub-commentary by Āchārya Vāchaspati Miśra on the Sūtra-Bhāshya
मुं.	Mun.	Mundakōpanishad
वे.सू.	V.S.	Vedānta Sūtras of Bādarāyana
सू.भा.	S.Bh.	Śankara's Bhāshya on the Vedānta Sutras. (Pages of the book published by the Nirṇayasagar Press, Bombay)
श्वे.	Sve.	Śvetāśvatarōpanishad

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
✆ : 08175-573820
2004

Badarayana's dictum :

2. We have now to determine the significance of certain narratives which are interspersed in the Upanishads. What might be the motive of the *Rshis* who introduced certain teachings with some narratives ? The ritualistically biased *mīmāmsakas* held that these are for being recited during the performance of certain sacrifices since the recitation has been enjoined by the Vedas. This contention of the Mīmāmsakas leads to a far-reaching consequence ; for if the story be a part of some ritual it would go to show that the Vedic texts do not serve the primary purpose of teaching the nature of Reality as Vedantins understand ; but like the Vedic mantras they are only subservient to the performance of Vedic rites. As against this argument Bādarāyana says :

पारिप्लवार्था इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात् । (वे. सू. ३-४-२३)

This cannot be so, for they have been particularized.

(V. S. 3-4-23)

(To explain) The injunction which begins with पारिप्लवम् आचक्षीत (He shall recite the Pāriplava) enumerates some particular narrative only such as that beginning with मनुर्वैवस्वतो राजा (The King Manu Vaivaswata etc.). This particularization would serve no purpose if it were intended to cover all Vedic narratives. तथा चैकवाक्यतोपबन्धात् (वे.सू. ३-४-२४) (Accordingly we find there is unity of thought in context in the teaching that follows;) for instance, the narrative of Yājnavalkya and Maitreyi serves the purpose of showing the importance of the science of the Vision of Atman by creating interest in the knowledge and eulogizing it.

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
✆ : 08175-573820
2004

"Śvetaketu, my dear boy, now that you are arrogant and impolite thinking yourself very learned, have you enquared about that entity needing special instruction by means of which even that which is not heard about becomes heard, even that which is not reflected upon becomes reflected upon, and even that which is unknown becomes known ?" "How, revered Sir, would that special instruction be ?"

(Ch. 6-1-3).

यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्॥ (छां. ६-१-४)

यथा सोम्यैकेन लोहमणिना सर्वं लोहमयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं लोहमित्येव सत्यम्॥ (छां.६-१-५)

यथा सोम्यैकेन नखनिकृन्तनेन सर्वं कार्ष्णायसं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं कृष्णायसमित्येव सत्यमेवं सोम्य स आदेशो भवतीति॥ (छां.६-१-६)

"In the same way, my dear boy, that by knowing a single lump of clay everything made of clay would have become known and the effect is merely a name being only a play of words; in the same way, my dear boy, that by knowing a nugget of gold, all that is made of gold would have become known and the effect is merely a name being only a play of words; in the same way, by knowing a single pair of nail scissors all that is made of steel would have become known and the effect is merely a name, being only a play of words, even so, my boy, is this Entity of special instruction." (Ch. 6-1-4, 5, 6).

5. Śvetaketu's study at the feet of his guru may be compared with that of a modern student's school and college career at a modern university where he has specialized in many subjects and come off with flying colours. Such a student would naturally think very high of himself when he goes back to his home flushed

with his success in having taken so many academic degrees. Śvetaketu is naturally proud that he has mastered all branches of Vedic learning in twelve years. The object of describing this attitude of the boy is to lay bare his secular knowledge in its true colours and to show that it dwindles into nothing beside the all-embracing wisdom of one who possesses the knowledge of Reality.

6. The question, "Have you asked your teacher about this precious teaching, for you seem to be so proud of your learning?" should not be interpreted to mean that one is justified in being proud even if one has gained mastery in any particular branch of knowledge. For, as a matter of fact, humility would be the one distinctive feature of a person who has known Brahman. The father only wants to say, "There is much more to know than you have dreamt of, during your academic career." The youth's curiosity is thus roused and he wants to know how there could possibly be anything so marvellous as to reveal the truth about everything else merely by knowing that one thing.

The principle of Causal Relation :

7. Uddālaka now reveals what is hidden in his heart. The knowledge that he is speaking of does not concern any wonderful thing like the philosopher's stone but only the metaphysical cause underlying all phenomena. In order to introduce his son to this ultimate cause, he begins by extending the Vedantic theory of causality to empirical things also, so as to enable Śvetaketu to realise that the so called effects of material causes do not actually exist apart from their supposed causes.

8. Herein lies the bearing of the introductory narrative on the subject matter of the Sixth Chapter. The Vedantic theory of

causation is that all the Universe is an effect of Brahman or Reality which is the material cause. That this theory is not the result of mere speculation can be seen by closely examining the relation of the empirical causes and their so called effects. Nobody can deny that jars, pots, pitchers and other vessels of clay are anything but clay except for the fact of their names, shapes and sizes and uses to which they are put in ordinary life. The material is all clay. Similarly ornaments of gold are nothing but gold and tools made of iron and steel are nothing but iron and steel only. Observation leads us to this conclusion everywhere with regard to material causes. Taking advantage of this fact, Uddālaka says that it is quite reasonable to hold that Brahman or Reality is the only underlying substance of the phenomenal world, notwithstanding the variety of names and things that we see here. Of this, more later.

No injunction about the means of knowledge :
Introductory:

9. There is one point more in Uddālaka's teaching that we have to notice here. It will be seen that he says: येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम् । "which being heard about, everything else will have been heard about, which being reflected upon everything else becomes reflected upon, and which being known everything else becomes known." These means of knowing Atman are also enumerated in the Maitreyi Brahmana.

आत्मनि खल्वरे दृष्टे श्रुते मते विज्ञाते इदं सर्वं विदितम् (बृ. ४-५-६)

Atman being seen, heard about, reflected upon and known, my dear, all this becomes known. (Br. 4-5-6)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्धयेतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

and concepts at the risk of the latter being misunderstood by the unwary.

Thus when Brahman or the Absolute is described as *sat*, Being, it is the intention of the teacher that it should not be supposed to exist in time or space like things in ordinary life to be restricted by certain features which distinguish it from things co-existent with it. In order to avoid both these contingencies, the whole of the Universe is conceived as though it were itself existent in the present and on the Absolute is deliberately superimposed a past time when the universe did not obtain in its present apparent form. In this deliberate superimposition it is described as though there was Being alone. The expression 'One without a second' is superadded to convey the idea that the word 'Alone' does not signify loneliness in circumstances when the non-existence of other things is conceivable. Thus 'Being alone', 'One only without a second' means the Absolute Self which being neither genus nor species knows nothing of its kind or of a different kind and not being partible is devoid of all distinction within its own-essential notion.

What is the meaning of the 'is'ness of Being ?

11. One who is usually given to think of objective phenomena only, would be perplexed to know what this proposition could possibly mean. What is the meaning of the statement "Being alone' was in the beginning of things ? Being, as it is commonly known, is only an attribute of things; Everything conceivable 'is'; We cannot conceive of anything whatsoever which has no being ; But to say that being 'is', sounds sheer tautology. Has it any more significance than,—for instance,—a statement like 'a horse is a horse' ? Moreover how could mere

being exist of its own accord, any more than redness can exist independently of a rose ? On the face of it, this proposition almost amounts to saying that before the beginning of things nothing existed.

Now this proposition which predicates existence of 'nothing' should either demand one to conceive of something positive since existence can appertain only to something that is positive or if we attach the face-value of absolute nothingness to what is signified by the word nothing 'was' would have to be interpreted to mean 'was not' which is absurd. So that on the whole the proposition would only amount to saying that something was something or that nothing was nothing! Being and non-being thus become synonymous!

In fact there have been a class of positive thinkers who suppose that nothing which has no attributes and which exists nowhere and nowhen can possibly exist. And the nihilists have always denied all existence. The section of Buddhists usually called by the name of Sūnyavādins inherits this nihilism by denying essence to everything. It may be surmised that these thinkers were only systematizing and echoing the view of the common man whose naive view is that the effect to deserve that name must be newly born and its cause should 'cause' it to take shape anew. As the Indian logician defines it:

'कार्यनियतपूर्ववृत्ति कारणम्'.

(the cause is that which invariably precedes the effect.)

But a little reflection will reveal the hollowness of this argument. For, in the first place we are talking of the state of the principal cause of all the Universe as the effect of that cause.

How could there be any time before the Universe shows itself, that is to say, how could there be any time before time itself makes its appearance, for time is a concomitant of the universe and cannot be torn from the latter by any feat of the intellect. Therefore Being or Reality cannot be supposed to be a cause in the sense that it is immediately antecedent to the universe. The word 'cause' therefore as applied to Being can only mean the *prius* to the idea of the universe. In the second place it will be seen that Uddālaka means Atman or the essence of everything by the word Sat or Being only, for, his repeated reference in the discourse is 'तत्सत्यं स आत्मा'. 'It is Reality, it is the Atman'. It is clear that Atman or the Self cannot be the cause of the universe in the sense that the antecedent clay is the cause of a clay jar or a pitcher.

One without a Second :

12. The proposition that 'the Being alone was' may, therefore, be compared to the sentence 'the river was flowing', just as the river and its flowing are one and the same thing, so *Being* and its *'is'ness* in the past are one and the same. This way of expressing the nature of Being has been adopted only to bring home the dissimilarity of the being of things in common life and the being of Being itself. Things are, that is, they exist in time or place but Being 'is' by virtue of its very nature or essence.

Similarly the expression 'one without a second' is only a device to reveal that Being is unlike a thing which is always conditioned by its qualities and number. A horse is always one with reference to another horse or some other animal or thing. But Being is the all and absolutely precludes the idea of any quality or number attached to it.

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

---

three elements in consonance with Taittiriya, only these three are mentioned here just to illustrate how the grosser objects in the world are all composed of the primordial elements.

Before entering into a detailed consideration of this latter part of creation we have to take up the subject of Consciousness as an aspect of the Absolute herein presumed by using the significant word ऐक्षत (It saw).

The controversy about Consciousness :

16. The followers of the Sānkhya system claimed that the expression सदेव ('Being alone') used at the commencement of this section could only mean Prakrti or the balanced state of the three gunas in the beginning of things, and argued that Sat as Brahman cannot possibly be meant here inasmuch as Being which is of the nature of Consciousness, is a perfectly changeless entity without body or senses ; It cannot be supposed to be an agent of the action of knowing which occurred at a particular point of time in the past. Therefore it stands to reason to assume that the Primordial Pradhānam though insentient in itself, may yet be spoken of as omniscient in a secondary sense since it comprehends the satva guna (the basic pre-supposition of knowledge) also along with Rajas and Tamas and since it is well known that Yogins owing to the attribute of Consciousness of Satva endowed with body and senses actually become omniscient. Even the Vedantin who holds that Brahman is omniscient should grant that its omniscience is due to its potency of knowing all. For if the knowledge of Brahman be eternal the latter would cease to be an agent of the action of knowing; On the other hand if that action be impermanent, Brahman would cease sometimes to know and consequently should be granted to

be omniscient only by virtue of His possessing the potency of omniscience. Moreover, Brahman is granted to be devoid of the factors requisite to produce knowledge before the origin of the universe and it is inconsistent to presume that, anyone devoid of body and senses can be credited with knowledge directly. Therefore the conclusion of the Sānkhya philosophers is that Being, mentioned in the first verse of the section, is the Pradhāna alone which is composed of many elements and can be allowed to evolve into an effect, like clay which being composed of parts can transform itself into effects like pots, Jars etc.

The witness alone can be omniscient:

17. Sankara rebuts this charge on the ground that a mere function of satva cannot be denoted by the verb 'to know' without someone witnessing it and hence it must be granted that Brahman which alone can be a witness of all is omniscient. As for the contention that if the act of knowing be eternal, Brahman cannot be held consistently to be the agent of that act, the opponent should be asked to explain how eternal Consciousness would contradict omniscience. It is self-contradictory to say that one who possesses eternal Consciousness capable of throwing light upon all objects is not omniscient. If it be objected that to speak of it as an agent of knowledge which is eternal is not reasonable, we say 'No', for we see the sun being spoken of in such terms as 'he burns, he shines upon things'. But it will be objected, that it might be consistent in the case of the sun in those terms, inasmuch as there are objects to be burnt or shone upon; whereas in the case of Brahman there is no contact of the knowledge with any object whatever and hence this comparison is not on all fours with this illustration. But we see usage allows us to say- 'the sun

shine' even when there is no object to be shone upon. So even if there be no object of knowledge, the usage 'it saw' (thought) is quite justified and hence there is no disparity whatever. Further, if it be supposed that an object is needed, Sruti texts speaking of Brahman as knowing all are more consistent. And what is this object at the time of creation? The reply is undifferentiated name and form intended to be differentiated, these (name and form) being undefinable as either identical with or other than Brahman.

Those proficient in the science of *Yoga* declare that even Yogins acquire knowledge of the past and future through the Grace of the Lord. How much more should it be deemed reasonable that that Lord, ever endowed with all perfections, should be possessed of eternal knowledge of creation, sustenance and dissolution of the world ?

As for the argument that it is not reasonable to think that the Ruler is able to know anything since He has no body or senses before creation, that objection is not valid here at all; since it is quite consistent and reasonable to think that there is no need for the means of knowledge since Brahman is eternally of the essential nature of knowledge itself just as the brightness of the sun is eternal. Moreover in the case of the transmigratory self, inflicted by ignorance and other defects, birth of knowledge may depend upon the body and other factors, but not in the case of the Lord who has no cause of obstruction to His knowledge. The following two *mantras* point out that the Lord is in no need of body and other factors but possesses unveiled knowledge throughout; For to Him there is neither body nor any instrument of knowledge and no one is seen equal to or greater than He.

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

---

differentiation of names and forms in the maze of phenomena like a hill, a river or a sea. Therefore Sankara while interpreting Badarayana Sutra "संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात्" (2-4-20) says that the Sruti 'I shall differentiate name and form' (Ch. 6-3-2) should be taken literally to mean that it is Supreme Devata, the Sat alone, that is responsible for the differentiation of all names and forms. Even where we know that the Jiva himself makes things and invests them with names and forms, the act should be ultimately traced to Sat, Brahman only, inasmuch as the Jiva is quite distinct from the Supreme Lord like an employed servant of a king and that is why in the Sruti अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य (entering into them in the form of my Jiva Self). It is said the Jivahood of the individual is only due to circumscribing conditions such as the body and the senses.

The three elements in the effects :

25. How each of these differentiated products of the elemental constituents reveal their triple nature is illustrated by the following texts :

यदग्ने रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्यापागादग्नेरग्नित्वं वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

यदादित्यस्य रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्यापागादादित्यादादित्यत्वं वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

यच्चन्द्रमसो रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्यापागाच्चन्द्राच्चन्द्रत्वं वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

यद्विद्युतो रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्यापागाद्विद्युतो विद्युत्त्वं वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥ (छां. ६-४-१, २, ३, ४.)

"What is seen to be the red colour of fire, that is the colour of the Primordial Fire; what is seen to be white that is the colour of Primordial Water; and that which is black is of the elemental Food. Thus the fireness (quiddity) of fire as the effect is a mere play of words, only a name; that the so called fire is only the colours is alone the reality". (Ch.6-4-1)

(The other texts are similarly translated. In place of the word fire, we have only to substitute 'the sun' 'the moon' and 'the lightning' respectively while rendering texts number 2, 3 and 4 respectively)

This extract should serve as a type for the analysis of all combinations of the three elementals. What is aimed at is the conclusion that every phenomenon in the universe is made of the constituents (fire, water and earth) which are themselves illusory manifestations of Sat, the Original Cause. The products of fire—the common fire, the sun, the moon and the lightning—enumerated here should be taken to be typical for the products of the other two elements also. The sum and substance of the argument is that every phenomenon is only an appearance of Reality, Being. This is what Gaudapada has described मायाजन्मम् "Illusory Birth of Reality." The so called effect is in its apperent aspect, a play of words, only a name, that is to say, our common sense, intellect in its ignorance gives a local habitation and a name to appearances only and lives in a fool's paradise so long as it has not realised their quiddity which is Brahman alone.

The Sankhya and the Vedanta Doctrines contrasted. Vedanta contrasted with Sankhya with regard to the effect :

26. Both the Sankhya and the Vedanta systems have accepted the theory of Sat-Karya (the pre-existence of the effect in the cause before its manifestation). For the Sankhya, the effect (the Universe) exists in the form of the cause, the Pradhana which evolves itself into Mahat and other effects at the time of creation. But this is only a hypothesis taken for granted on the basis of reasoning that the effect of the nature of things conducing to pleasure, pain and delusion should have come from a cause similar to it in nature. For us, Vedantins, however, the effect pre-exists in the cause Brahman. The Sankhyans and other adverse critics object to this on two grounds. In the first place this is against the accepted doctrine of Sat-Karya in the system and in the second place the effect according to Advaita will have to be confessed to be dissimilar to the cause. Sankara rebuts these charges as follows:

यदि चेतनं शुद्धं शब्दादिहीनं च ब्रह्म तद्विपरीतस्याचेतनस्याशुद्धस्य शब्दादिमतश्च कार्यस्य कारणमिष्येत, असत्तर्हि कार्यं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिति प्रसज्येत । अनिष्टं चैतत्सत्कार्यवादिनस्तवेति चेत् ? नैष दोषः ; प्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् । प्रतिषेधमात्रं हीदं नास्य प्रतिषेधस्य प्रतिषेध्यमस्ति । न ह्ययं प्रतिषेधः प्रागुत्पत्तेः सत्त्वं कार्यस्य प्रतिषेद्धुं शक्नोति । कथम् ? यथैव हीदानीमपीदं कार्यं कारणात्मना सत्, एवं प्रागुत्पत्तेरपीति गम्यते । न हीदानीमपि इदं कार्यं कारणात्मानमन्तरेण स्वतन्त्रमेवास्ति ; 'सर्वं तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनः सर्वं वेद' (बृ.२-४-६) इत्यादिश्रवणात् । कारणात्मना तु सत्त्वं कार्यस्य प्रागुत्पत्तेरविशिष्टम् । ननु शब्दादिहीनं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणम्, बाढम् ; न तु शब्दादिमत्कार्यं कारणात्मना हीनं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिदानीं वास्ति । तेन न शक्यते वक्तुं प्रागुत्पत्तेरसत्कार्यमिति ॥

(सू.भा. २-१-७ ; पा. १८९.)

If Brahman which is Conscious, Pure and devoid of sound and other qualities is affirmed (hypothecated) as the cause of or effect opposed to it, its nature being inert, impure and invested with sound etc., then it would lead to the conclusion that the effect is non-existent before its birth, and this is repugnant to you, holding as you do, the doctrine of the pre-existence of the effect (even before its birth !)

(Reply:) This is no defect in our system. For it is a mere negation.

(To explain:) This is a bare negation ; for there is no object to be negated here. How is this ? The reply is that, in the same way as the effect is even now existent as the cause, even so it is to be concluded that it is existent before its birth. For even now its effect has no independent existence of its own except as that modification of the cause. The Sruti says, 'everything would reject him who would recognise anything as other than Atman' (Br. 2-4-6). The existence of the effect as identical with the cause of course, is nothing peculiar to it at the time preceding creation.

Objection : Well, but Brahman without sound and other qualities is the cause of the world ?

Reply: Of course, yes. But there is no world with sound and other qualities apart from its form as the cause, whether before creation or even now. Therefore it cannot be maintained that the effect has no being before its birth. (S.Bh. 2-1-7 ; P. 189)

And elsewhere Śankara observes:

तस्माद्यथा घटकरकाद्याकाशानां महाकाशानन्यत्वम्, यथा च मृगतृष्णिकोदकादीनामूषरादिभ्योऽनन्यत्वम्, दृष्टनष्टस्वरूपत्वात्, स्वरूपेणानुपाख्यत्वात्, एवमस्य भोग्यभोक्त्रादिप्रपञ्चजातस्य ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेणाभाव इति द्रष्टव्यम् ॥ (सू.भा. २-१-१४ ; पा. १९७)

"Therefore just as jar space and a drinking pot space have no independent existence apart from space in general and just as the water of a mirage and the phenomena have no existence independent of a mirage and other things, these being of a nature just appearing and disappearing the next moment and indefinable in their character, so also, one should know that this phenomenal world consisting of distinctions like the experienced objects and experiences has no being other than that of Brahman." (S.Bh. 2-1-14; P. 197)

The Doctrine of Maya :

27. The two excerpts quoted above should suffice to give the lie direct to the view adumbrated in some quarters that Sankara does not recognize the doctrine of *Maya* anywhere, the doctrine that the whole of the Universe before us with all its imposing characteristics of reality is nought in itself; it is no more than a mirage enticing thirsty people walking about in a sandy desert. At the same time Sankara wants us to believe firmly that it is not a hallucination ; its paraphernalia of names and things is really a manifestation of Pure Being or Pure Consciousness which is the Self of us all. As the Chandogya Bhashya has it:

तत एव द्वैतभेदेन अन्यथागृह्यमाणत्वात् नासत्त्वं कस्यचित्क्वचिदिति ब्रूमः । यथा सतोऽन्यद्वस्त्वन्तरं परिकल्प्य पुनस्तस्यैव प्रागुत्पत्तेः प्रध्वंसाच्चोर्ध्वं असत्त्वं ब्रुवते तार्किकाः, न तथास्माभिः कदाचित्क्वचिदपि सतोऽन्यदभिधानमभिधेयं वा वस्तु परिकल्प्यते । सदेव तु सर्वमभिधानमभिधीयते च यदन्यबुद्ध्या । यथा रज्जुरेव सर्पबुद्ध्या सर्प इत्यभिधीयते, यथा वा पिण्डघटादि मृदोऽन्यबुद्ध्या पिण्डघटादिशब्देनाभिधीयते लोके ॥ रज्जुविवेकदर्शिनां तु सर्पाभिधानबुद्धी निवर्तेते ॥ (छां.भा. ६-२-३ ; पा. ५१०.)

"What we say is that nothing anywhere is unreal, inasmuch as it

is Being alone that is mistaken for the world of duality and difference. Just as it is a rope alone that is called a 'snake' when it is mistaken for a snake or just as a lump of clay or a jar is taken to be other than clay and is called by names like 'lump', 'a pot' etc., but for those who have distinctly recognized the rope or the clay, the names and ideas of a snake or a jar cease to exist, so also for those who have distinctly recognized the Absolute Being (as the only Reality) the name and the idea of an effect cease to exist" (Ch. Bh. 6-2-3 ; P. 510)

Mayic Existence of the Effect in the Cause:

28. That the fire, the sun, the moon and the lightning cited above are intended to be only illustrative of the general doctrine of mayic existence of all effects in the primary cause, the Pure Being, is corroborated by the following texts:

एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुः पूर्वे महाशाला महाश्रोत्रिया न नोऽद्य कश्चनाश्रुतममतमविज्ञातमुदाहरिष्यतीति ह्येभ्यो विदाञ्चक्रुः ॥

(छां. ६-४-५)

यदु रोहितमिवाभूदिति तेजसस्तद्रूपमिति तद्विदाञ्चक्रुर्यदु शुक्लमिवाभूदित्यपां रूपमिति तद्विदाञ्चक्रुर्यद् कृष्णमिवाभूदित्यन्नस्य रूपमिति तद्विदाञ्चक्रुः ॥ (छां. ६-४-६)

यद्वविज्ञातमिवाभूदित्येतासामेव देवतानां समास इति तद्विदाञ्चक्रुर्यथा नु खलु सोम्येमास्तिस्रो देवताः पुरुषं प्राप्य त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदेकैका भवति तन्मे विजानीहीति ॥ (छां. ६-४-७)

"Knowing this, the ancient ones who possessed spacious homes and who were highly learned in sacred lore said : 'There is none amongst us who says anything he has not heard about, reflected upon, and known'. They knew everything from these illustrations." (Ch. 6-4-5).

"Whatever appeared as red, they knew to be the colour of fire; that which appeared as white, they knew to be the colour of water; and whatever appeared as black they knew to be the colour of food or the earth. (Ch. 6-4-6)

"And whatever appeared to be unknown, that they knew to be an aggregate of these Devatas alone. How these three Devatas on getting into the body become triplicated severally, you may now learn from me." (Ch. 6-4-7)

अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते तस्य यः स्थविष्ठो धातुस्तत्पुरीषं भवति यो मध्यमस्तन्मांसं योऽणिष्ठस्तन्मनः ॥ (छां. ६-५-१)

"Food eaten is divided into three (stages of refinement), of that the grossest part becomes faeces, that part which is of medium refinement becomes flesh and that which is the most refined part becomes the mind." (Ch. 6-5-1)

This section of the teaching aims at stressing the material notion of the entire ego-complex.

आपः पीतास्त्रेधा विधीयन्ते तासां यः स्थविष्ठो धातुस्तन्मूत्रं भवति यो मध्यमस्तल्लोहितं योऽणिष्ठः स प्राणः ॥

तेजोऽशितं त्रेधा विधीयते तस्य यःस्थविष्ठो धातुस्तदस्थि भवति यो मध्यमः स मज्जा योऽणिष्ठः सा वाक् ॥ (छां.६-५-२, ३)

"Water (liquid food) drunk is divided into three; of that the grossest part becomes urine and that which is of medium refinement becomes blood and the most refined part becomes the vital force (Prana)".

"The product of fire taken is divided into three, the grossest part becomes the bone, that which is of medium refinement becomes marrow and the most refined part becomes the organ of speech."(Ch. 6-5-2,3)

29. The details given above of the physical and psychic components of a man need not be literally or critically examined and compared and contrasted with the findings of modern physiology and psychology. The one fact which is stressed is that all not-self, internal or external to man, including his body, is composed and made up of the Primordial elements and the elements themselves are the illusory manifestations of Sat-Pure Being, which is the only Reality. The following text summarizes the conclusion to be remembered about this ego-complex of which the mind (presumably including the senses), the vital force and the organ of speech are the chief constituents.

अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वागिति भूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥ (छां. ६-५-४)

"Of food, my dear boy, is the mind constituted; of water is constituted the vital force (Prana) and of fire is speech constituted. 'May your revered self be pleased to enlighten me further on the point'. 'All right, my dear boy', said (Uddalaka) 'I shall do so." (Ch.6-5-4)

The Purport of the Sequel :

30. The next instalment of the narration is intended to serve as an elucidation of how the mind is a product of food. We shall simply reproduce the relevant texts with their English rendering:

दध्नः सोम्य मथ्यमानस्य योऽणिमा स ऊर्ध्वः समुदीषति तत्सर्पिर्भवति ॥

एवमेव खलु सोम्यान्नस्याश्यमानस्य योऽणिमा स ऊर्ध्वः समुदीषति तन्मनो भवति ॥ (छां. ६-६-१, २)

"Of the curd that is churned, my boy, the refined portion rises up and that becomes butter. Even so, my dear boy, the finer part of

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते स्वंह्यपीतो भवति ॥

(छां. ६-८-१)

"Uddalaka, son of Aruna, said to his son Svetaketu, 'Now, my dear boy, know from me the state of sound sleep. When a man is said to be asleep ('स्वपिति नाम') then, my dear boy, he becomes one with Sat. He is dissolved unto Himself; therefore they say about him that he sleeps (स्वपिति). It is well known that he is dissolved into his own Self." (Ch.6-8-1)

[Here the Sruti takes up the word *Svapiti* used in common life and offers a fanciful derivation for *Sva* (into his own Self,) *Apiti* (is dissolved). This is, of course, not according to any grammarian but only a mnemonic to draw the attention of the aspirant to the actual state of Jiva in that state. The word *Svapnantah* (स्वप्नान्त:) might mean the dream state also and even then the true nature of Jiva is partially revealed ; for all the conditioning associates such as the body, the mind and the senses of the waking state are replaced there by their semblances and yet Atman retains His nature intact, thus showing that it is not the inherent nature of the Jiva to be restricted to the individual notion found in waking or confined within the precincts of the waking world. But sound sleep is specially mentioned here because Jiva not only loses his identity as conditioned by the body, the senses and the mind of the waking state, but also because the whole universe with all its paraphernalia limited by time, space or causality has vanished here absolutely. There is nothing to distinguish him from Pure Being.]

34. Śankara in his Sutra Bhashya thus explains the significance of the word *Svapiti* (स्वपिति) in this context.

(१) मनःप्रचारोपाधिविशेषसम्बन्धात् इन्द्रियार्थान् गृह्णन् तद्विशेषापन्नो जीवो जागर्ति, तद्वासनाविशिष्टः स्वप्नान् पश्यन् मनःशब्दवाच्यो भवति, स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायां उपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इव इति 'स्वं हि अपीतो भवति' इत्युच्यते ॥ (सू.भा.१-१-९; प. ३२-३३)

(1) "The Jiva is awake, when owing to contact of the conditioning factors of the nature of modifications of the mind, he identifies himself with them. As qualified by their impressions, he sees dreams and is then denoted by the word, 'Mind'. When both these conditioning associates disappear, he has no distinguishing feature and is therefore 'dissolved,' as it were, into his own Self, and so the Sruti says 'It is well known that he is dissolved into his own Self".

(S.Bh, 1-1-9: Pp. 32-33)

[Here it is clear that Śankara recognizes only two sets of conditioning associates which determine the Jiva nature of the individual self; but some post-Śankara commentators, recognizing as they do another conditioning adjunct which they call 'Positive Avidya', take advantage of the expression प्रलीन इव (dissolved as it were), and interpret the Bhashya to "mean that the Jiva is only partially dissolved and has not yet become completely merged in Pure Being in sound sleep. This later interpretation is not only not faithful to Śankara's view but also lays the axe at the very root of Vedantic teaching about the pristine purity of Jivatman to which we revert daily in sound sleep.]

Before proceeding further we shall quote two passages from the Sutra Bhashya which leave us in no doubt whatever on this point:

(२) सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति । परस्माच्च

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

सुषुप्तावस्थायां कदाचित्सता सम्पद्यते कदाचिन्न संपद्यते इत्ययुक्तम् ॥
(सू. भा.३-२-७ ; पा. ३५१)

(3) "Moreover there is no time when there is no unity of Jiva with Brahman, for the essential nature of a thing can never disappear. Only relative to the foreign nature which he puts on, as it were, in dream and waking, he is said to resume his own nature in sleep. For this reason also it is improper to say that he becomes united into one or with Being only on a certain occasion but is not united on other occasions." (S.Bh. 3-2-7; P. 351)

35. It is clear that Śankara closely follows the Upanishads in declaring that the Jiva does become One with the secondless Atman who has been designated by the significant name of Sat (Being). This is from the standpoint of waking which obliges us to believe that we possess an aggregate of the body, the senses and the mind. Looking at each state from its own standpoint, it is, however, obvious that the states are only apparent not-selves superimposed upon Atman, appearing and disappearing without leaving any stain on the eternally pure nature of Atman. It thus follows that Atman as Brahman is the only Reality.

36. This is not mere speculation but reasoning on the basis of facts experienced by all. Accordingly Śankara writes:

यद्यपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्तव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम्, नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः सम्भवति ; श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते । स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयो-रुभयोरितरेतरव्यभिचारादात्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, सम्प्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना सम्पत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मत्वम्, प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात्कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेक

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

दिशं दिशं पतित्वान्यत्रायतनमलब्ध्वा प्राणमेवोपश्रयते प्राणबन्धनं हि सोम्य मन इति ॥ (छां. ६-८-२.)

"In the same way as a bird with a string flies in this direction and that, and finding no abode of rest, it would seek refuge in the very post to which it is tied up, so also, indeed, my dear boy, it is that this 'mind' flies in this direction and that, but finding no abode of rest, seeks refuge in the Prāṇa alone at last, for the mind is tied up to Prāṇa."

(Ch. 6-8-2)

Here Prāṇa is another name given to Being in its causal aspect. Prāṇa or substratum is the aspect of Brahman on which all aggregates of body and senses are supported. And 'mind' is the name assigned to Jivas, because mind is the conditioning associate of Jivas during their mundane life.

38. We have so far discussed the Vedantic theory of causation and the oneness of Jiva with Brahman during sleep. Before entering into a detailed account of this oneness, Uddālaka makes certain incidental observations on the inter-relation of the three primordial elements. His mnemonic about sleep, Swapiti (स्वपिति), reminds him to place before his son the other similar derivations of words पिपासति (feels thirsty) and अशिशिषति (feels hungry) before he resumes the subject of सत्सम्पत्तिः (becoming one with Being). We shall now state the texts at length with translation and see what conclusions Śankara draws from these.

अशनापिपासे मे सोम्य विजानीहीति यत्रैतत्पुरुषोऽशिशिषति नामाऽऽप एव तदशितं नयन्ते तद्यथा गोनायोऽश्वनायः पुरुषनाय इत्येवं तदप आचक्षतेऽशनायेति तत्रैतच्छुङ्गमुत्पतितं सोम्य विजानीहि नेदममूलं भविष्यतीति ॥ छां. ६-८-३.

"Know the truth about hunger and thirst, my boy, from me. When a person is spoken of as अशिशिषति (he feels hungry), then water alone leads on that which is eaten. Just as they speak of गोनाय (leader of cattle), अश्वनाय (leader of horses), पुरुषनाय (leader of men), so also they call water by the name अशनाय (leader of food eaten). You should know, my dear son, that it is thence this offshoot has sprouted. This can never be without a cause." (Ch. 6-8-3)

तस्य क मूलं स्यादन्यत्रान्नादेवमेव खलु सोम्यान्नेन शुङ्गेनापो मूलमन्विच्छाद्भिः सोम्य शुङ्गेन तेजो मूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा सोम्य शुङ्गेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजा सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठाः ॥
(छां. ६-८-४)

"Where else could its cause be if not food? In like manner too, my dear boy, from the offshoot food trace the cause, water; from the offshoot water, my dear boy, trace the cause, fire ; from the, offshoot fire, my dear boy, trace the cause, Being. All these beings, my dear boy, have their cause in Being and Being alone have they for their residing abode and in Being alone they ultimately merge themselves". (Ch. 6-8-4)

अथ यत्रैतत्पुरुषः पिपासति नाम तेज एव तत्पीतं नयते तद्यथा गोनायोऽश्वनायः पुरुषनाय इत्येवं तत्तेज आचष्ट उदन्येति तत्रैतदेव शुङ्गमुत्पतितं सोम्य विजानीहि नेदममूलं भविष्यतीति ॥(छां.६-८-५)

"And when a person is spoken of as पिपासति (feels thirsty) then it is heat that leads on what is drunk. Just as they speak of a गोनाय (leader of cattle), अश्वनाय (leader of horses), पुरुषनाय (leader of men), so also one calls 'fire' by the name उदन्य (leader of water), thirst. And know that, my dear boy, it is thence that this offshoot has sprouted.

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

with all its paraphernalia dissolves itself in the Reality called Prana here. The view commonly entertained that the external world with all the inhabitant Jivas and inanimate objects continues to exist in spite of one Jiva going to sleep is unwarranted from the standpoint of intuition and is supported only by the extension of our experience of other Jivas in our waking world. This world, it will be seen, is concomitant with waking and cannot by any subterfuge be made to pass on either to dream or sleep.

45. When therefore all the Jivas have become one with Atman in whom their being was super-imposed in waking, there is no meaning in supposing that they had become one with Atman in the past and then to expect that they ought to remember it in the waking as though the Jiva has travelled from state to state in succession in a single time series. The illustrations of different juices commingling and becoming one with honey is on all fours with the Jivas becoming one with Sat (Being).

46. This argument is in perfect harmony with the Chandogya Bhashya, which remarks :

एवमेव खलु सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजा अहन्यहनि सति संपद्य सुषुप्तिकाले मरणप्रलययोश्च न विदुर्न विजानीयुः सति सम्पद्यामह इति सम्पन्ना इति वा ॥ **(छां. भा. ६-९-२ ; पा. ५२८)**

"In the same manner, my dear boy, all these beings becoming one with Sat during sleep daily, during death, and general dissolution, are not aware that they are becoming one with Being or that they have become one with Being". (Ch. Bh. 6-9-2 ; P. 528)

And this will be in consonance with the next passage.

त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्धयेतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

individuality is absolute ; for it would be consistent with the fact that it is the material cause. To explain : it has been established that the Supreme *Devata* is the material cause of everything that is born. Therefore we have to conclude that this non-distinction is absolute. To this *prima facie* view we say: that group of subtle elements like fire, which is the locus of organs such as hearing, continues to be till complete dissolution, that is, till release from samsara due to right knowledge ; for samsara (transmigration) has been described in Śrutis like 'some embodied ones go into the womb for assuming bodies ; others go to the state of a motionless tree, each in conformity with past karmas and haunting ideas' (Ka.2-2-7), for otherwise everyone would absolutely become one with Brahman at the time of death itself owing to the disappearance of all conditioning associates and so the *Śastra* dealing with injunctions would be purposeless and so would be the *Śastras* dealing with right knowledge. Besides, it is not reasonable that bondage due to misconception should loosen without right knowledge. Therefore even while everything has (the supreme Devata) for its material cause this attainment of oneness with Being (at the time of death) must be concluded to be with a residue of latency (of the fire etc.), just like (the attainment of oneness) during sleep and dissolution".

(S.Bh. 4-2-8; P. 483).

48. This doctrine of the conditioning association due to ignorance of the true nature of Brahman (now and then referred to by Śankara) has been developed by post-Śankara sub-commentators into a theory of residue of Positive Avidya in sleep and into the suicidal corollary of the continuance of the distinction of the individual self and the Supreme Self even in sound sleep. It passes one's understanding how these Vedantins reconciled themselves to a conclusion that forces them to believe that there

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

"Your reverence may please enlighten me further."

"So, be it, my boy," said he "I shall do so." (Ch. 6-9-4)

49. While Śvetaketu is satisfied that the Jiva cannot recognize his oneness in sleep because of oneness, he cannot make out how it can be that not one of the Jivas ever remembers on waking, his having emerged from Being. Here is Uddālaka's explanation:

इमाः सोम्य नद्यः पुरस्तात्प्राच्यः स्यन्दन्ते पश्चात्प्रतीच्यस्ताः समुद्रात्समुद्रमेवापियन्ति स समुद्र एव भवति ता यथा तत्र न

एवमेव खलु सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सत आगम्य न विदुः सत आगच्छामह इति त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तदाभवन्ति ॥ (छां. ६-१०-१, २)

"These rivers, my dear boy, flow, the eastern ones to the east, and the western ones to the west. They come from the sea and merge themselves in the sea alone. All that becomes only the sea. Just as they do not know themselves there as this river or that, so also, my dear boy, all these creatures having come from Being do not know that they have come from Being only. Whatever they are here-whether a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, or a boar, or a worm or a firefly or a gnat or a mosquito, that they become again". (Ch. 6-10-1, 2)

50. Just as in the case of honey, the different juices lose their identity and become all honey, so in the case of the sea also the rivers which originate in the clouds and become rivers, flowing in different directions, lose themselves in the sea. In the sea all rivers become part and parcel (undifferentiated) of the sea and can never be distinguished individually ; so also with

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्धेतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

"Just as, my dear boy (when) some one should bring a person blind folded from the country of Gandhara, and then leave him in an uninhabited region and when that person shouted out towards the East or towards the North or towards the South or towards the West crying 'I have been brought blind-folded and left blindfolded!' and then some one should loosen his bonds and say 'this way lies the country of Gandhara, so you had better go in this direction' and he, enquiring his way from village to village and becoming well informed and also clever, would at last reach the country of the Gandhara ; even so, a person who has a good teacher, would know the Reality. And for him the delay would be so long as he is not freed and then he would immediately become one with Being". (Ch. 6-14-1, 2)

58. The point of comparison is that just, as the person kidnapped and blindfolded, so also the common man does not know his way to Atman, because the senses like the kidnappers in the illustration make him always look in the wrong direction.

59. His inner eye has to be opened and the right direction shown to him. He has to be directed by one who knows the Truth to turn inwards and see the Atman as He is. Another point is that the seeker should also be able to reason and judge for himself in accordance with the direction given by the teacher, for in this case, it is the aspirant alone that has to intuit the Self. Accordingly Śankara writes in his Sutra Bhasya :

वेदान्तवाक्यानि हि सूत्रैरुदाहृत्य विचार्यन्ते ; वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः, नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता । सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिषु तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्यायानुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते । श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात् । तथा

हि 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' (बृ. २-४-५) इति श्रुतिः, 'पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसम्पद्येतैवमेवेहाचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद' (छां. ६-१४-२) इति च पुरुषबुद्धिसाहाय्यमात्मनो दर्शयति । न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्, किं तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम् ; अनुभवावसानत्वाद्भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ॥ (सू. भा. १-१-२, पा. ७, ८)

"It is the Vedanta texts that are adduced and discussed, for the intuition of Brahman is to result from the enquiry and determination of the meaning of the texts and not from the application of syllogistic inference and other such means of right knowledge. While there are Vedantic texts teaching the cause of the origination etc. of the world, inference also unopposed to Vedantic texts may become a means, in order to place on a firm ground the comprehension of the exact meaning of the texts and is not to be ruled out, for the Sruti itself accepts reason as an aid. To explain : the Sruti quotations, 'Atman is to be heard about, reflected upon and again just as the well-informed and clever person would at last reach the country of the Gandharas; even so, here a person, who has a capable teacher, knows the Reality', permit the aid of man's intelligence."

"Sruti, etc., alone are not here the means of knowledge in the enquiry into the nature of Brahman as in the case of the enquiry into the nature of Dharma; but Sruti and intuition, etc., also are the means here, as the case may be, because the knowledge of Brahman has to culminate in the intuition of Brahman and it has for its object an existent entity." (S.Bh. 1-1-2, Pp. 7, 8)

60. So far we have considered the various doubts and difficulties with regard to the question of *sat sampatthi* in sleep and other kindred states. Uddalaka, having cleared all possible

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

"To such a one who has a competent teacher there is only so much delay 'for being merged in his real nature as *Sat*' must be supplied. How much delay in time ? The answer is 'so long as thou art not released'. This must be interpreted to mean, 'so long as he is not released' by altering the first person of the verb to suit the context. The meaning is : till the body falls off after experiencing the Karma which has produced the present body." (Ch.Bh.6-14-2; P. 535.)

63. This is evidently in the nature of a concession to the popular view that the wise man also has a body due to his Prarabdha Karma that has fructified in the birth as this body. The truth from the highest standpoint, however, is that the knower of Truth who understands the meaning ot the text, 'That Thou Art, is ever free even while he appears to have a body.' That is why Śankara writes in his Sutra Bhashya :

अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् ; 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म' (बृ.३-४-१) इति श्रुतेः, 'तत्त्वमसि' (छां. ६-८-७) इति च सिद्धवदुपदेशात् । न हि 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यस्य वाक्यस्यार्थस्तत्त्वं मृतो भविष्यसीत्येवं परिणेतुं शक्यः । 'तद्धैतत् पश्यन् ऋषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च' (बृ. १-४-१०) इति च सम्यग्दर्शनदर्शनकालमेव तत्फलं सर्वात्मत्वं दर्शयति ॥ (सू. भा.३-३-३२,पा.४०७)

"But the result of knowledge is immediately intuited. For the Śruti says 'That which is direct, and immediate is Brahman'. And the teaching 'That Thou Art' is as of something that is already existent. Surely the meaning of the sentence 'That Thou Art' cannot be twisted to mean 'That thou wilt become after death'. The Śruti, seeing this indeed Rishi Vamadeva realized, 'I have become Manu and Surya' points to the result of right knowledge as accruing simultaneously with it." (S.Bh. 3-3-32. P. 407)

Elsewhere Sankara writes :

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वाऽहमासं नेदानीं नापि भविष्यत्काल इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति ॥

(सू.भा. ४-१-१३, पा. ४७३)

"The knower of Brahman has arrived at this conclusion : 'As opposed to the previously supposed nature of being an agent and experiencer of the fruits of action—I am Brahman of the nature of Being for all the three periods of time, never an agent or experiencer of fruits of action; not even before this was an agent or experiencer nor ever such now nor shall I be such in the future either."

(S.Bh. 4-1-13. Pp. 473)

64. The conclusion to be drawn from this is therefore that it is only metaphorical to say that either naturally at sleep and other states or metaphorically at the time of enlightenment any one actually becomes one with Being. For there never was a time when there was anything else by the side of Pure Being or Brahman. It is as a concession to the popular view that the universe exists apart from Brahman that the oft-repeated truth is enunciated by Uddālaka.

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो इति भूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥ (छां.६-१५-३)

"Now it is this subtle Entity that all this universe has for its essence. It alone is real. That is the Atman, That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu." 'May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further'. 'So be it, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch. 6-15-3)

65. What remains now about which Svetaketu wants to be enlightened ? It is only to know whether this merging in the

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

अपि चान्त्यमिदं प्रमाणमात्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकं नातः परं किञ्चिदाकांक्ष्यमस्ति । यथा हि लोके यजेतेत्युक्ते किं केन कथमित्याकांक्ष्यते, नैवं 'तत्त्वमसि', 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इत्युक्ते किञ्चित् अन्यदाकांक्ष्यमस्ति; सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वावगतेः । सति ह्यन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणेऽर्थे आकांक्षा स्यात् । नत्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणो अन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति य आकांक्ष्येत । न चेयमवगतिर्नोत्पद्यते इति शक्यं वक्तुम् ; 'तद्धास्य विजज्ञौ' (छां. ६-१६-२) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः । अवगतिसाधनानां च श्रवणादीनां वेदानुवचनादीनां च विधानात् । न चेयमवगतिरनर्थिका भ्रान्तिर्वेति शक्यं वक्तुम् । अविद्यानिवृत्तिफलदर्शनात्, बाधकज्ञानान्तराभावाच्च । प्राक्चात्मैकत्वावगतेरव्याहतः सर्वः सत्यानृतव्यवहारो लौकिको वैदिकश्चेत्यवोचाम ॥ (सू. भा. २-१-१४ ; पा. १९९-२००)

"Moreover, this means teaching the oneness of Atman is ultimate and nothing more to be questioned remains beyond this. Unlike the meaning of the injunction 'one should sacrifice' in ordinary life which gives rise to questions 'what', 'with what means' and 'how ?' the hearing of the statement, 'That Thou Art or 'I am Brahman' does not give rise to anything more to be enquired into, for the intuitive knowledge is about the unity of the Self of all. It is only when something else remains (to be known) an enquiry would arise ; but there remains nothing to be enquired into beyond the unity of Atman nor can it be said that this intuition is not born at all, for there are texts like 'this teaching of the father he understood' and as the means of understanding It, such listening to the Śrutis and the study of the Vedas etc., has been enjoined. Further it cannot be said that this knowledge is useless or delusive, for we see the result of it in the eradication of ignorance and there is nothing else which sublates it. We have already said all ideas of true and false, secular and Vedic, goes on intermittently only before

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

---

without an essence of their own, which is the doctrine of the Buddhist Nāgārjuna and his followers.

This Kārika, on the other hand, purports to say that Reality or the Real Self is such that nothing can be predicated of It.

71. But how can anyone teach such a thing? Teaching and learning evidently imply speaking and grasping something through the mind and that means using the assistance of concepts. There is no speech without words and every word implies a concept. To think is to judge and judgment implies putting together two or more concepts together and weighing them. And there is no judgment unless we put one concept to predicate something, to qualify something denoted by another concept or unless we analyse the concepts that go together to synthesise them so as to denote a whole, made up of certain parts. So, whatever method we may adopt we are constrained to submit to a process of expressing or implying something which concepts cannot grasp. How do the Upanishads or the teachers, who teach the Upanishadic doctrine of Reality without a second, succeed in imparting the Truth to us ?

This difficulty is, no doubt, inevitable with regard to phenomenal things. But the Reality that the Upanishads and the Rshis attempt to teach is nothing phenomenal or objective. They have, therefore, openly admitted that it cannot be taught through words or caught through concepts. (यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह) - That from which words turn back unable to reach there together with the mind (Tai. 2-9). But yet there is the advantage in teaching Reality, for it is the Essence,-Self (Atman) of all and everything ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं स आत्मा) and is the only Reality worth

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

intuition. The latter are intuitions in the sense that those sense objects or feelings of heat and cold, etc., are directly experienced by the senses of sight, hearing, touch, etc., and that the mental phenomena of desire, wrath, avarice, wonder, fear, etc., are directly felt and not reasoned. In all these cases the objects intuited are distinct from the subject, but in the case of the Self and its intuition, they are identical. Thus when we say : "I intuit my Self", we are using a language very much similar to that which we employ when saying, 'the fire burns', 'the light shows itself' or 'the stream flows'. And when we use the language like, 'Svetaketu came to intuit his Self as the Self of all and the only Reality' we are using the word Svetaketu to denote an individual boy who lived in a particular place and discussed the Vedantic doctrine with his father. And the "intuition" of the Self that he arrived at, at the end of the discussion should be likened to the vision of the sun that a person has of the sunrise with the aid of the twilight, with whose assistance he began to look about and see all things around him. We know all the while that it is the very sunlight that helped him to see the sun. It is one and the same whether we say "I am so and so, who managed to see the sun" or "The sun showed himself to Mr. so and so". Similarly "Svetaketu had an intuition of Atman" is the same as saying "The Universal Atman revealed Himself to be identical with Svetaketu's Self, after all the seeming mental obstructions to the intuition were cleared away in the light of that Intuition". From the empirical point of view, things appear in time and place and events happen at particular points of time in certain regions, while, transcendentally speaking, nothing happens or appears to anybody because there are no concepts of time and apace independent of Atman. **Reality is all that is.**

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

4. We have now to consider the meaning of the word (अणिमा) Subtle (Entity). Does it mean something very tenuous like rarefied air or very minute like the scientist's chemical atom? This cannot be, for Uddālaka is here talking of Pure Being which is One without a second, which is 'the essence of all this'. Besides It is the cause which created and transformed Itself into all the universe and then It cannot in Itself be any one of the categories (such as substance, quantity, quality, relation etc.) or even the Psychic entities which Its seeming effects superimposed upon it. That is why Uddālaka says that it is Reality (सत्यम्) as distinguished from all superimposed Objects. Therefore (अणिमा) Subtle Entity is only another name for something neither perceivable nor conceivable, but is the substrate of all that is born. In fact, all that is born thrives and finally merges is being in it. Reality is subtle in the sense that it is Pure Consciousness through which everything shines and there is nothing which can objectify and throw light on It nor is there any need for it.

5. This Reality as the Universal Witnessing Principle is the only Atman in the real sense of the word. The individual selves in the empirical world are mere reflections, as it were, of this Real Atman. They are therefore really one with the Absolute Being even as they are.

THE TEXT TEACHING

The Identity of the Jiva and Iswara

6. 'तत् त्वम् असि' 'That Thou Art', therefore states an eternal verity and it might have been addressed to any one of these innumerable Jivas of all times.

7. Strictly speaking, 'तत् त्वम् असि' (literally 'That Thou

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

Knowledge of Atman, no Meditation

8. It goes without saying that this sentence तत् त्वम् असि does not enjoin or imply any sort of meditation, as for instance, in 'अनन्तं वै मनः' (Infinite, indeed, is the mind - Br. 3-1-9), 'मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत' (One should meditate on the mind as Brahman - Ch. 3-18-1), 'आदित्यो ब्रह्मेत्यादेशः' (The sun is Brahman, such is the instruction - Ch. 3-19-1), 'प्राणो वाव संवर्गः' (Prana is indeed sovereign, all inclusive - Ch. 4-3-3). In all such sentences two different things are enjoined to be meditated upon as though they were one. But in the present case 'That' and 'Thou' do not refer to two different things, but actually to one and the same entity. Swetaketu is really the same as the Pure Being proposed to be taught. We have already quoted the Upanishadic text which expressly negates that Brahman in its true nature can be meditated upon - so says Śankara :

> सम्पदादिरूपे हि ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविज्ञाने अभ्युपगम्यमाने 'तत्त्वमसि', 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि', 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म'- इत्येवमादीनां वाक्यानां ब्रह्मात्मैकत्व-वस्तुप्रतिपादनपरः पदसमन्वयः पीड्येत ॥ (सू.भा.१-१-४, पा. १६)

If the knowledge of the identity of Brahman and Atman were to be taken to be of the nature of meditations like imagination (सम्पत्), then the syntactical relation of the words purporting to teach an existent fact viz., the identity of Brahman and Atman, would be contradicted."

(S. Bh. 1-1-4, P. 16)

9. How then is one to know that Brahman beyond speech and thought really exists ? This question has already been answered when we explained that Brahman being the enquirer's own Self is to be intuited as such. This is how Swetaketu understood his father's teaching तद्धास्य विजज्ञौ (Ch. 6-16-3).

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

Truth. ' That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu' means you have no need to become That, you have no need to be taught the truth about It; you are already That. In fact, the conventional distinctions of teaching, teacher and taught are only to facilitate knowing. You are the one Reality without a second ; neither a teacher nor one to be taught.

11. Śankara therefore illustrates this truth by the rope-snake which is removed by stating the truth that it is a rope :

यावद्धि अविद्या न निवर्तते तावद् धर्मादिगोचरत्वं जीवस्य जीवत्वं च न निवर्तते। तन्निवृत्तौ तु प्राज्ञ एव 'तत्त्वमसि' इति श्रुत्या प्रत्याय्यते। न चाविद्यावत्त्वे तदपगमे च वस्तुनः कश्चिद् विशेषोऽस्ति। यथा कश्चित् संतमसे पतितां काञ्चिद्रज्जुम् अहिं मन्यमानः भीतो वेपमानः पलायते तं चापरो ब्रूयात् मा भैषीः नायमहिः रज्जुरेवेति। स च तदुपश्रुत्याहिकृतं भयमुत्सृजेद्वेपथुं पलायनं च। न त्वहिबुद्धिकाले तदपगमकाले च वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषः स्यात्॥

(सू. भा. १-४-६, पा. १५४)

"So long as अविद्या (ignorance) is not removed, Jiva's being within the range of right (and wrong) and Jivahood never disappear ; but when ignorance does disappear, it is the *Prājna* (ever-knowing Atman) Himself that is revealed by the text 'That Thou Art'. Reality Itself is not affected in anyway either by being ignorant or its disappearance. This may be likened to the instance when some one takes a rope lying in deep darkness for a snake and runs away trembling with fear ; and listening to some one else who tells : 'Do not be afraid; it is not a snake but only a rope', he gives up his fear of the snake, his trembling and running away. All the same, the thing itself would not be affected in any way whatsoever, whether during the time it is taken for a rope or when the notion of its being a snake is removed. So also we are to understand the matter under discussion".

(S.Bh. 1-4-6, P. 154)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

---

१) न हि जीवो नामात्यन्तभिन्नो ब्रह्मणः ; 'तत्त्वमसि', 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' - इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः । बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिकृतं तु विशेषमाश्रित्य ब्रह्मैव सन् जीवः कर्ता भोक्ता चेत्युच्यते ॥ (सू. भा. १-१-३१, पा. ६१)

1) " The Jiva so-called is not altogether different from Brahman, for there are Sruti texts like 'That Thou Art', 'I am Brahman'. But in consideration of the apparently particular form due to the intellect and other conditioning associates the Jiva, though really Brahman itself, is said to be an agent and experiencer (of fruits of actions)."

(S. Bh. 1-1-31, P. 61)

२) यत्तत्परं ज्योतिरुपसम्पत्तव्यं श्रुतं तत्परं ब्रह्म । तच्चापहतपाप्मत्वादिधर्मकम्, तदेव च जीवस्य पारमार्थिकं स्वरूपम् 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादिशास्त्रेभ्यः, नेतरदुपाधिकल्पितम् । यावदेव हि स्थाणाविव पुरुषबुद्धिं द्वैतलक्षणामविद्यां निवर्तयन् कूटस्थनित्यदृक्स्वरूपमात्मानमहं ब्रह्मास्मीति न प्रतिपद्यते तावज्जीवस्य जीवत्वम् । यदा तु देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिसङ्घातादुत्थाप्य श्रुत्या प्रतिबोध्यते, नासि त्वं देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिसङ्घातः नासि संसारी, किं तर्हि ? तद्यत्सत्यं स आत्मा चैतन्यमात्रस्वरूपः तत्त्वमसि' इति - तदा कूटस्थनित्यदृक्स्वरूपमात्मानं प्रतिबुध्यास्माच्छरीराद्यभिमानात्समुत्तिष्ठन् स एव कूटस्थनित्यदृक्स्वरूप आत्मा भवति ॥ (सू. भा. १-३-१९, पा. ११२)

2) " That Supreme Light which has got to be attained, that is the highest Brahman, and that has properties like the nature which has done away with sin etc. That alone is indeed the real nature of Jiva, vide texts like ' That Thou Art', and not the other one conjured up by the conditioning associates. When, by the Śruti, one is taken beyond the aggregates - the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, and is taught thus: 'Thou art not the aggregate of the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, thou art not the transmigratory soul, but that

Reality, that Atman of the nature of Pure Consciousness,' 'That Thou Art', then one realizes oneself as of the nature of changeless, eternal Witness; and transcending this samsāra of identifying oneself with the body etc., one becomes that very Atman of the nature of changeless eternal Witness." (S.Bh. 1-3-19, P. 112)

३) पर एवात्मा देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्ध्युपाधिभिः परिच्छिद्यमानो बालैः शारीर इत्युपचर्यते । यथा घटकरकाद्युपाधिवशादपरिच्छिन्नमपि नभः परिच्छिन्नवदवभासते, तद्वत् । तदपेक्षया च कर्मकर्तृत्वादिभेदव्यवहारो न विरुध्यते प्राक् 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यात्मैकत्वोपदेशग्रहणात् ॥ (सू. भा. १-२-६, पा. ६७)

3) "The Supreme Atman Himself as delimited by the conditioning associates - the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect - is spoken of, by the ignorant as the embodied one. This is like unto the appearance of ether, in itself unconditioned, as though it were conditioned by a big pot or a small jar etc. And relative to this it is not incongruous to talk of the differences of subject and object and the like before grasping the unity of Atman taught by the text 'That Thou Art'."

(S.Bh. 1-2-6, P. 67)

४) न हीश्वरस्य संसार्यात्मत्वं प्रतिपाद्यत इत्यभ्युपगच्छामः, किं तर्हि ? संसारिणः संसारित्वापोहेनेश्वरात्मत्वं प्रतिपिपादयिषितमिति । एवं च सति अद्वैतेश्वरस्यापहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणता, विपरीतगुणता त्वितरस्य मिथ्येति व्यवतिष्ठते ॥ (सू. भा. ४-१-३, पा. ४६४, ४६५)

4) "For we do not hold that Isvara is taught to be a transmigratory soul, but that the nature of being a transmigratory soul is negated and it is proposed to teach his Isvarahood. Thus it will be settled that the nature of being free from sin and other such property of the secondless Isvara is true, while the nature of being possessed of properties of an opposite nature on the part of the other self is false."

(S.Bh. 4-1-3, Pp. 464, 465)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

---

because there are the Sruti texts like 'That Thou Art', and 'know the Kshetrajna to be Myself' (Gita 13-2) (S.Bh. 1-2-12, P. 74)

८) काशकृत्स्नस्याचार्यस्याविकृतः परमेश्वरो जीवो नान्य इति मतम्। .... तत्र काशकृत्स्नीयं मतं श्रुत्यनुसारीति गम्यते; प्रतिपिपादयिषितार्थानुसारात्, 'तत्त्वमसि' (छां. ६-८-७) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः॥(सू. भा. १-४-२२, पा. १८१)

8) "The opinion of teacher Kāśakṛtsna is that the Supreme Lord, unchanged, is Himself the Jiva, and none other; .... now we may conclude that Kāśakṛtsna's opinion follows the Śruti, for it is in accordance with what is proposed to be taught and there are Śruti texts like ' That Thou Art'." (S.Bh. 1-4-22, P.171)

९) जीवस्यापि तु दुःखप्राप्तिरविद्यानिमित्तैवेत्युक्तम्। तथा चाविद्यानिमित्तजीवभावव्युदासेन ब्रह्मभावमेव जीवस्य प्रतिपादयन्ति वेदान्ताः - 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्येवमादयः॥ (सू. भा. २-३-४६, पा. ३००)

9) "Even for Jiva, we have already said that suffering is due to ignorance only. Accordingly Vedanta texts like 'That Thou Art' negate the Jiva-hood of Jiva and teach that he is Brahman Itself."

(S.Bh. 2-3-46, P. 300)

१०) अपवादो नाम - यत्र कस्मिंश्चिद्वस्तुनि पूर्वनिविष्टायां मिथ्याबुद्धौ निश्चितायां पश्चादुपजायमाना यथार्था बुद्धिः पूर्वनिविष्टाया मिथ्याबुद्धेर्निवर्तिका भवति। यथा देहेन्द्रियसङ्घाते आत्मबुद्धिरात्मन्येवात्मबुद्ध्या पश्चाद्भाविन्या 'तत्त्वमसि' - इत्यनया यथार्थबुद्ध्या निवर्त्यते॥ (सू. भा. ३-३-९, पा. ३८२)

10) "Sublation (अपवाद) is an appositional proposition, wherein a false notion entertained as correct is removed by a subsequent correct notion, as for instance, the notion of self entertained in the aggregate of the body and the senses is sublated by the correct notion of the Self in the real Atman Himself born from the text 'That Thou Art'."

(S.Bh. 3-3-9, P. 382)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यद्येतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

"This Brahmanhood of the embodied soul is self-established and not something to be achieved with the help of a distinct effort. And hence this Śāstraic identity with Brahman becomes the sublator of the naive nature of being an embodied soul, like, the correct ideas of the rope and other existent things which sublate the false ideas of the snake and other appearances. When the nature of one's being a migratory soul is sublated, then all human behaviour depending on it will become sublated." (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 197)

[This naturally suggests the Vedantic doctrine that all human behaviour resting on the belief of the reality of thinking, speaking and acting in respect of phenomenal objects is only an appearance, like that in a dream. With regard to this see below.]

15. If it be admitted that all that is, is the One Pure Being or Brahman alone, where would the valid means of right knowledge find any room since there would be no objects of knowledge at all ? Would not the entire Veda portion consisting of injunctions and prohibitions be out of place ? And can the unreal give rise to a real result ? How can the text 'That Thou Art', in itself unreal, give rise to a correct knowledge of the nature of Brahman ? Strictly speaking, this question does not arise on the transcendental level, where, as we have already seen, there is neither ignorance nor knowledge ; neither bondage nor release. But yet Śankara raises this objection from the empirical point of view and rebuts it from the same standpoint.

१) नन्वेकत्वैकान्ताभ्युपगमे नानात्वाभावात् प्रत्यक्षादीनि लौकिकानि प्रमाणानि व्याहन्येरन्, निर्विषयत्वात्, स्थाण्वादिष्विव पुरुषादिज्ञानानि। तथा विधिप्रतिषेधशास्त्रमपि भेदापेक्षत्वात् तदभावे व्याहन्येत, मोक्षशास्त्रस्यापि शिष्यशासित्रादिभेदापेक्षत्वात् तदभावे व्याघातः स्यात्। कथं चानृतेन मोक्षशास्त्रेण प्रतिपादितस्यात्मैकत्वस्य सत्यत्वमुपपद्येतेति ? अत्रोच्यते, - नैषदोषः ;

सर्वव्यवहाराणामेव प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताविज्ञानात् सत्यत्वोपपत्तेः, स्वप्नव्यवहारस्येव प्राक्प्रबोधात्। यावद्धि न सत्यात्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्तिस्तावत्प्रमाणप्रमेयफललक्षणेषु विकारेष्वनृतत्वबुद्धिर्न कस्यचिदुत्पद्यते। विकारानेव तु अहं ममेत्यविद्ययात्मात्मीयेन भावेन सर्वो जन्तुः प्रतिपद्यते स्वाभाविकीं ब्रह्मात्मतां हित्वा। तस्मात् प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताप्रतिबोधादुपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः। यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने उच्चावचान् भावान् पश्यतो निश्चितमेव प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति प्राक्प्रबोधात्, न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले भवति, तद्वत्॥ (सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८)

1) "(Objection :-) If unity alone is accepted as real, there would be no plurality and consequently perception and other empirical valid means of knowledge would be nullified, having no objects to make known, just like the ideas of man etc., in a post or the like and the Śāstra, dealing with the injunctions and prohibitions, would lose its vocation depending as it does upon plurality. And the Śāstra dealing with liberation, depending as it does on differences like the teacher and the taught, would find no vocation for propounding Truth. And how could the unreal Śāstra dealing with liberation consistently reveal the real unity of the Atman ?

(Reply :-) This is no defect, for all conventions can consistently be real before the dawn of the knowledge of the identity of Atman with Brahman, just as all procedure in a dream is real before one wakes up. (To explain :-) So long as the knowledge of the unity of the real Atman has not dawned, no one happens to entertain the idea of unreality regarding phenomena presenting themselves as valid means of knowledge, objects of knowledge and the resultant knowledge of those objects. And it is the modifications that every born soul regards as 'me and mine' through अविद्या (ignorance) seeing them as related to one's own self and things owned by one's self, abandoning the idea of his inherent nature of oneness with Brahman. Therefore before the dawn of enlightenment of one's oneness with Brahman every conventional

procedure, whether secular or sacred, is quite consistent. In the same way as for the common man, who has fallen into a dream and there sees things of varying ranks, knowledge of phenomena would be felt to be surely real, a direct perception and not merely an apparent perception, so also appears the knowledge with regard to human procedure here." (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 198)

२) कथं त्वसत्येन वेदान्तवाक्येन सत्यस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वस्य प्रतिपत्तिरुपपद्येत ? न हि रज्जुसर्पेण दष्टो म्रियते । नापि मृगतृष्णिकाम्भसा पानावगाहनादिप्रयोजनं क्रियत इति । नैष दोषः ; शङ्काविषादिनिमित्तमरणादिकार्योपलब्धेः, स्वप्नदर्शनावस्थस्य च सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्यदर्शनात् । तत्कार्यमप्यनृतमेवेति चेत्, ब्रूयात्, तत्र ब्रूमः - यद्यपि स्वप्नदर्शनावस्थस्य सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्यमनृतम्, तथापि तदवगतिः सत्यमेव फलम् ; प्रतिबुद्धस्याप्यबाध्यमानत्वात् । न हि स्वप्नदृष्टं सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्यं मिथ्येति मन्यमानस्तदवगतिमपि मिथ्येतिमन्यते कश्चित् ॥

(सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८, १९९)

2) "(Objection :-) But how can the unreal Vedantic text consistently lead to the knowledge of the real identity with Brahman ? Surely one bitten by a rope-snake, does not die ; nor can the water seen in a mirage be efficient to lead to results like actual drinking or bathing.

(Reply :-) There is really nothing wrong for we find death and the like real effects, arising out of the suspected poison and in the case of one who is in a state of dream, effects like a snake-bite or bathing in water are also seen to be produced.

(Objection :-) But one might urge that the effect also is unreal !

(Rejoinder :-) To this, we reply that while the snake-bite or bathing in water is unreal, the resultant knowledge of such acts is quite real for it is not sublated even on waking.

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतदवेदिषुर्यद्ध्येतदवेदिष्यन् कथं मे नावक्ष्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so." (Ch.6-1-7)

---

which is displayed in the case of this dialogue between Svetaketu and his father. For whom is it meant and what purpose does it serve ? It cannot be argued in the strain of either of the sub-commentators that it aids the mind in developing itself to have a direct realization of the Reality, for as we have already seen, Brahman is the Witnessing Consciousness and the very Self of even the mind which reflects and which therefore can objectify Reality at no stage of its development.

The answer is here :-

यस्य तु नैषोऽनुभवो द्रागिव जायते तं प्रत्यनुभवार्थ एवावृत्त्यभ्युपगमः । तत्रापि न तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थात्प्रच्याव्यावृत्तौ प्रवर्तयेत् । न हि वरघाताय कन्यामुद्वाहयन्ति । नियुक्तस्य चास्मिन्नधिकृतोऽहं कर्ता मयेदं कर्तव्यमित्यवश्यं ब्रह्मप्रत्ययाद्विपरीतप्रत्यय उत्पद्यते । यस्तु स्वयमेव मन्दमतिरप्रतिभानात्तं वाक्यार्थं जिहासेत्तस्यैतस्मिन्नेव वाक्यार्थे स्थिरीकार आवृत्त्यादिवाचोयुक्त्याऽभ्युपेयते ॥ (सू. भा. ४-१-२, पा. ४६३)

"For him to whom this intuition does not dawn all at once, it is only to induce this intuition that a repeated instruction (and graded understanding) is admitted. Even in his case, the aspirant must not be drawn astray from the meaning of the text 'That Thou Art' and urged to repeat (and revolve in the mind this notion)- For people do not give a bride in marriage just for murdering the bridegroom - and if so urged, the idea would spring up to him. 'I am urged to this act ; I am an agent of action. This is done by me'- an idea which is the very reverse of the notion of oneness with Brahman.

Repetition and the like expressions are only employed to denote that one, who is dull of intellect and who not being able to understand would himself discard what is meant by the text, should be made to stick to the meaning of the text above." (S.Bh. 4-1-2, P.463)

The above extract evidently aims at stressing the fact that by *manana* is meant the attempt to remove all difficulties of the seeker that would crop up because of his habitual inclination to phenomenal facts which taken at the face value would seem to be in conflict with the Vedantic doctrine of Perfect Unity. The arguments used in the Śāstra and to be used by the teacher should be based upon intuition and should be such as to lead again and again to the one doctrine which is based on final intuition. The word 'स्मृति' *Smṛti* (used in Sūtra 4-1-1) has been misunderstood in so many quarters that instead of meaning 'repeated appeal to intuition' it has even degenerated into muttering repeatedly like a mantra and even persons occupying high positions have been seriously maintaining that तत्त्वमसि (That Thou Art) is a महावाक्यमन्त्र (a mantra containing a grand text signifying the identity of the Jiva and Isvara) and there have been serious disputes about whether or not the right to initiate disciples in this mantra rests in a particular mutt.

17. The word '*nididhyāsana*' is conspicuous by its absence in the Chandogya. One who has understood (विजानी) is of course a 'ब्रह्मसंस्थ' (छां. २-२३-१) or a 'ब्रह्मनिष्ठ' as he is described in another Upanishad (Mu. 3-1-4). But the discipline of *nididhyāsana* is not mentioned here and therefore has to be left over for discussion of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka where it actually occurs.

For the present, it will be enough to state that a comeptent teacher who rests in Brahman (ब्रह्मनिष्ठ) alone could know where to use any of the items of discipline that are proper for disciples and that *nididhyāsana* has a place in *Sravaṇa* or *Manana* also, whether actually expressed by that name or not.

OM TAT SAT

ENGLISH BOOKS

Books Authored by Sri. S.S. Swamiji

Sl.No.	*Name of the Book*	*Pages*
1.	**NARADA'S APHORISMS ON BHAKTI** (The book will serve as a valuable guide to those who wish to tread the path of Bhakti)	32 P.
2.	**MINOR WORKS OF SRI SANKARACHAARYA** (Contains 16 most popular minor works of Sankara)	68 P.
3.	**SANKAR'S CLARIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN VEDANTIC CONCEPTS** (Some more deep seated misconceptions among students and scholars of Vedanta are clarified in this valuable text)	90 P.
4.	**HOW TO RECOGNISE METHOD OF VEDANTA** (Introduction to Sanskrit Text, "Vedanta Prakriya Prathyabijna of Vedantic thought upto the time of Sarvajnatma Muni)	120 P.
5.	**AVASTHATRAYA OR THE UNIQUE METHOD OF VEDANTA** (Method of three states of Consciousness, which our real Self transcends. A valuable introduction to the study of Vedanta as a pure philosophy)	16 P.
6.	**SALIENT FEATURES OF SANKARA VEDANTA** (Presents matter and method of genuine Sankara Vedanta in a small compass)	110 P.
7.	**MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT SANKARA VEDANTA** (All criticisms on Vedanta are convincingly solved using the genuine traditional methodology of Sankara Vedanta)	120 P.
8.	**VISION OF ATMAN** (The different aspects of three means of intuitive knowledge, to wit, Sravana, Manana and Nididhyasana are explained)	120 P.
9.	**INTUITION OF REALITY** (The Vedantic Knowledge is not mere subtle intellectualism but is intuition of Reality, arising through Divine Grace)	105 P.
10.	**UPANISHADIC APPROACH TO REALITY** (The Unique Method of teaching Vedanta adopted by Shri Gaudapada, Sankara & Sureshwara)	50 P.
11.	**THE SCIENCE OF BEING (This is in your hand)** (Deals with Chapter VI of Chandogya Upanishads. Presents in a nut-shell the true nature of the Science of Being)	108 P.

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by

SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers

Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya

Holenarasipur - 573211

©: 08175-573820

2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
✆ : 08175-573820
2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
©: 08175-573820
2004

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by

SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers

Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya

Holenarasipur - 573211

©: 08175-573820

2004